

REMARKS

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, 23-25, 28, 30-32 and 34 remain in this application. Claims 15, 16, 24 and 25 stand allowed. Claims 22-25 and 29-34 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests re-examination.

The office action objected to the drawings on the grounds that they do not show the feature recited in claims 31 and 34, “fluorescent light source being positioned to transmit light through the sheet of light pipe.” Applicant respectfully traverses.

Referring to Figure 1 of the drawings, backlight assembly 11 is clearly illustrated in the drawings and is described in the specification at page 8, lines 8 and 9 and page 9, lines 5-16 as a fluorescent light source. Looking at Figure 1, it is clear that fluorescent light source 11 is positioned to transmit light through the sheet of the light pipe.

Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The office action objected to the specification on the grounds that the limitation of claim 15, “selectively switching on a first group of like colored LEDs in the array but not all the LEDs in the array” is not in the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The office action is referred to page 10, lines 7-18 wherein the operation of the switches 36, 37 and 38 with respect to an LED array as shown in Figure 2A is described. Specifically, the specification notes “for the Type 1, Class A monochrome radiance requirement, only the green LEDs are addressed by closing only the switch 37.” This description, in combination with the description that all the LEDs “are addressed together by closing all three switches 36, 37, and 38” clearly sets forth that the system is adapted for “selectively switching on a first group of like colored LEDs in the array but not all of the LEDs in the array.

Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 7-8, 21 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lippmann* in view of *Mosier*. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 7 includes the allowable subject matter of claim 33. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 7 is now allowable. Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and, therefore, claim 8 is also allowable. Claim 21 depends from claim 7 and, therefore, claim 21 is also allowable.

Claim 28 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 29. Claim 28 is, therefore, seen as allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In light of the above amendment and remarks, applicant believes that all the claims in this application are now in condition for allowance, respectfully requests an early indication of same, and the passing of this application to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail No. EV632762495US in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 3, 2005.

By: Marc Fregoso

Marc Fregoso
Signature

Dated: August 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Albin H. Gess
Albin H. Gess
Registration No. 25,726
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (714) 427-7020